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Phase 1
- April – June 2017
- 31 PGY-1’s
- Foundations of Discipline
- 7 EPA’s

Phase 2
- October 2017 – August 2018
- 98 PGY-1 to PGY-3’s
- Core and Foundations of Discipline

Phase 3
- September 2018
- All EPAs available
- EPA-1: Initial management
- EPA-2: Ongoing management
- EPA-3: Consulting specialists
- EPA-4: Discharge planning
- EPA-5: Unstable patients
- EPA-6: Goals of care
- EPA-7: Identifying learning needs
Research Questions

- Do trainees find EPA encounters valuable?
- Do trainees find EPA encounters disruptive?
- Is the qualitative feedback provided in EPA’s actionable?
- REB: formal approval not required as classified as QI
- In addition to EPA assessment, questions added on to form:
  - Was this a valuable educational encounter?
  - Did this disrupt workflow?
  - How long did the process take?
- 123 EPA’s were anonymized and reviewed (phase 1 data only)
All EPA’s reviewed independently by 2 authors

Qualitative comments coded

- 1. Actionability (0: not actionable, 2: actionable)
- 2. Value (0: not valuable, 1: indeterminate, 2: valuable)
- 3. Disruption (0: disruptive, 1: indeterminate, 2: not disruptive)

Results (1/2)

Value

N = 123 EPA’s Reviewed

N = 91 Excluded

N = 32 EPA’s Analyzed

Disruption

N = 123 EPA’s Reviewed

N = 62 Excluded

N = 61 EPA’s Analyzed
- N = 123 EPA’s Submitted
- Mean time to complete an EPA: 8.5 minutes
- Actionability (N = 123)
  - Actionable: 7.4% (n=9)
- Valuable (N = 32)
  - Valuable: 96.9% (n=31)
- Disruption (N = 61)
  - Not disruptive: 65.6% (n=40)
The majority of feedback was not actionable
  – Limited benefit in improving future performance?
  – Is actionable feedback given verbally?
  – Do we expect actionable feedback if a resident is entrusted?

In the majority of submissions, trainees found the process valuable
  – Sampling bias?
  – Unclear number of residents in sample

Small sample size (123)
  – Value and disruption: exclusion due to indeterminate answers
Despite not regularly receiving actionable feedback, the majority of EPA’s submitted were deemed a valuable educational encounter that did not disrupt workflow.
Next Steps

- Phase 1
  - Evaluator perspective (value, disruption)
  - evaluate by number of residents, not number of EPAs

- Phase 2
  - Further data analysis to include both Foundations and Core of Discipline
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